

bringing the total number of nations we have normalized trade relations with this year to four.

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the staff which have worked late nights and long weekends to ensure that the Tariff Suspension and Trade Act of 2000 was a success. On the Finance Committee Minority staff, Linda Menghetti, Timothy Hogan, Holly Vineyard, and Pat Heck, and on the Majority staff, Grant Aldonas, Faryar Shirzad, Tim Keeler, and Carrie Clark worked tirelessly to ensure the passage of this important bill. Polly Craighill, of the Legislative Counsel's Office, spent countless hours drafting and redrafting this extensive piece of legislation. Anita Horn and Gary Myrick of the Minority leadership were also crucial to its final passage. Mr. President, we have taken three major steps forward since Seattle, and I hope the momentum will continue.

THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, before the Senate passes the miscellaneous tariff bill, I would like to bring attention to a provision in the bill that would grant permanent normal trade relations, PNTR to the Republic of Georgia. In general, I support the proposition that the time is ripe for Georgia to receive PNTR. However, I also think we should recognize that the Republic of Georgia has demonstrated enforcement of internationally recognized core labor standards.

Georgia grants its citizens the right to emigrate. It is a leader in democratic reform in the Caucasus. It has a relatively strong human rights record. It has been shedding its status as a non-market economy, and this year became a member of the WTO. And it has been an important strategic partner of the United States.

To a certain extent, these accomplishments are acknowledged in the preambulatory clauses to the PNTR grant. But there is something missing. There is no recognition of Georgia's effective record of enforcing internationally recognized core labor standards and its demonstrated commitment to continue its protection of worker rights in the future. I hope that this gap can be filled in when the bill goes to conference.

Why should a grant of PNTR to Georgia acknowledge that country's protection of worker rights and its commitment to continue protecting worker rights? Because, increasingly, U.S. trade policy is reflecting the link between trade and labor. Different countries' different levels of protection of core labor standards have an impact on trade. We cannot ignore that. Indeed, we affirmatively recognized that fact in both the China/PNTR bill and in the Africa/CBI bill.

It stands to reason that when we make a significant change in our trade

relationship with another country—as when we grant PNTR—we ought to take account of that country's enforcement (or lack of enforcement) of core labor standards. Here, the country in issue has a strong record in this area. We ought to recognize that fact, since it reinforces the case for granting PNTR. This sends an important signal to future PNTR candidates.

Therefore, I hope that, in conference, we will be able to include a simple recognition of Georgia's record and its commitment going forward.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. The Senator's point is a good one and I will press it in conference.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill be read a third time and passed, as amended, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (H.R. 4868), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

MAKING A TECHNICAL CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 4868

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Con. Res. 152, which makes a technical correction in the enrollment of H.R. 4868 and, further, the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 152) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 152

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 4868) to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to modify temporarily certain rates of duty, to make other technical amendments to the trade laws, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following correction:

On page 160, line 8, strike “: and” and all that follows through line 10, and insert a period.

SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to discuss the troubling developments in the Middle East. Given what has happened in the past several days, it is increasingly apparent that we are at a dangerous juncture in a critically important region of the world. The United States can and must stay engaged in the Middle East.

First and foremost, Mr. President, my heart goes out to the families of the seventeen sailors reported killed

and the 36 injured in the explosion yesterday on the U.S.S. *Cole* off the coast of Yemen. These brave individuals lost their lives or suffered injury in defense of our country, our values, and our future. This explosion underscores the danger that the men and women of our Armed Forces face every day, and our debt of gratitude for the duty they undertake.

All evidence strongly suggests that yesterday's explosion was a terrorist attack. Such an attack is senseless and cowardly, and those responsible will be found and brought to justice. The world should know that the President and the Congress stand united on this score.

We will not grant the perpetrators an ounce of satisfaction that they have succeeded in altering the way the United States conducts business. We will remain a force for stability. We will continue to press for a negotiated peace in the Middle East. We will stand against insecurity and senseless violence in the Middle East and throughout the world. We owe that much to the brave sailors who were killed yesterday.

Recent days have also confronted us with a stream of horribly violent incidents in Israel and the territories. Unfortunately, efforts to end unrest have yet to succeed. Yesterday two Israeli soldiers were killed in a distressing scene of mob violence as protests gave way to deadly confrontation. I deplore that violence, Mr. President, and I call on Chairman Arafat to raise his voice in favor of peace.

I have followed with grave concern the violence that has gripped Israel and the territories for more than two weeks. After years of instability and violence, this region of the world—so riven with religious and strategic interests—was experiencing relative calm. This state of affairs was born out of an emerging consensus among all parties in the region that the future peace and security of Israel and the territories could be decided only through negotiation. The outlines of and expectations for a lasting peace were beginning to take shape. A successful conclusion to these negotiations seemed tantalizingly close just two short months ago when Israel made unprecedented compromises in the name of peace.

In addition to the human toll exacted by the recent string of violent incidents, there has been another equally tragic casualty—at least in the short term. The events of the past week or so have apparently punctured the hope for a quick peace settlement, putting at risk the great progress that had been made toward settling long-standing Israeli-Palestinian differences. Moreover, the latest crisis in Israel and the territories also threatens wider regional conflict, as evidenced by the abduction of three Israeli soldiers by

Hezbollah guerrillas operating out of Lebanon as well as Iraqi troop movements. The stakes, Mr. President, are high and the time is short.

If we are to return to the path of a peaceful settlement after the events of the last two weeks, we must first end the violence. A cessation of hostilities can only be accomplished if all sides demonstrate leadership by condemning the violence. I am sorely disappointed in Arafat and the Palestinian Authority and in the fact that they have allowed violence to be carried out without restraint or comment.

Preferring instead to blame the violence on what he terms Israeli provocations, Arafat has refused to publicly and unequivocally call for an end to violent protests and confrontations. Palestinian police have failed to control mob violence. And efforts at re-establishing negotiations have been rebuffed. The result is despicable violence that has cost far too many innocent lives.

Rather than being unable to control the violence—as Chairman Arafat claims—his silence leaves the impression that he condones it. The on-again off-again cooperation with Israeli security forces suggests that Arafat prefers using violence and the threat of wider war as a negotiating tool. Such tactics are cynical, dangerous and stand in stark contrast to the Oslo process that brought the region to brink of a comprehensive peace just two short months ago.

Meanwhile Prime Minister Barak has remained committed to negotiations and the Oslo Process. He took great risks at Camp David in July. He offered remarkable concessions on issues that go to the very core of his country's history and identity—compromises that no one had considered possible before President Clinton convened the Camp David talks.

Despite subsequent violence provocations, Barak has repeated his interest in restoring calm, ending the violence and returning to the negotiating table. When he was approached by President Clinton to join an emergency summit, he readily stated his interest and willingness in participating.

And unlike Arafat, Barak has clearly denounced violence. He implored Israelis not to participate in the violence when he said, "I urge our Jewish citizens to refrain from attacking Arabs and their property under any circumstances."

Time is short in the Middle East, Mr. President. The risk of a wider regional conflict is very real. The first step toward assuring that the situation improves is a strong public statement from Chairman Arafat calling for an end to the violence.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR CONNIE MACK

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a friend and an outstanding public servant who is retiring from the United States Senate this year after 18 years in public service, Senator CONNIE MACK of Florida.

I have had the privilege of serving with Senator MACK in both houses of Congress. And I know him as a man deeply committed to the finest ideals of public service, as well as the beliefs he so passionately holds.

Perhaps no one believes more fervently in the inherent potential of each and every individual than Senator MACK. For him, it is not government that creates wealth or success or personal fulfillment. It is the American people. To give people opportunity—to give them the skills they need to compete and reach their greatest potential—is for Senator MACK perhaps the greatest end that government can serve.

I have also known Senator MACK as a staunch proponent of fiscal responsibility, back to the days when it often seemed that talk of balanced budgets was only slightly more fashionable than actually balancing the budget. I have to believe he must share my sense of wonder as to how far we've come, and it is thanks in no small part to the efforts of Senator MACK and those like him who have fought for years to make the current surpluses a reality.

Senator MACK has been a strong voice for the Sunshine State in the United States Senate. Most recently, his tireless efforts in helping to shepherd through the Senate the historic Everglades restoration plan, the Restoring the Everglades, an American Legacy Act, leaves a positive and lasting mark on Florida and one of our nation's true natural treasures that will be appreciated for generations to come.

One could argue, however, that Senator MACK has pursued no other goal with a higher degree of dogged determination than increasing our federal investment in medical research. He rightly sees this issue as a matter of national importance, knowing no political, social, financial, or racial boundaries.

He recognizes that disease touches every American family. Certainly, it has had a profound impact on his own family, including his wife, daughter, brother, and both parents—as well as affecting his own life.

Characteristically, Senator MACK and his wife, Priscilla, who is a courageous breast cancer survivor, met these challenges first with courage and dignity, and then with an unyielding determination to do something about them.

Both have been extremely active in spreading the word on the importance of early detection. As co-Chair of the bipartisan Senate Cancer Coalition,

Senator MACK has provided outstanding leadership on matters relating to our fight against cancer, and in particular I have been honored to work with Senator MACK on providing greater funding for breast cancer research.

The depth of Senator MACK's concern when it comes to this dread disease cannot truly be measured. Certainly, having worked on this issue throughout my tenure in Congress, I was honored and thankful for Senator MACK's participation in a breast cancer hearing, or "breast cancer summit", we convened in 1996, but I was not surprised that he would be there to contribute his wisdom and his support.

From that summit came legislation to establish a national data bank of information on clinical trials involving experimental treatments for serious or life-threatening diseases. It also mandated that a toll-free number be instituted for patients, doctors and others to access this information.

Senator MACK has literally been instrumental in securing increased funding for medical research in general, and indeed for the fiscal year 2000 fought for the inclusion of a \$2.3 billion increase for the National Institutes of Health. And he has rightfully called for funding to NIH to be doubled from \$12.75 billion to over \$25 billion over the next five years.

Finally, Mr. President, to quote a piece from the St. Petersburg Times from last year, "the Senate will lose one of its nicest members." And that is absolutely true. Senator MACK has strongly held beliefs on the issues, let there be no doubt.

But he has always understood the fine but certain distinction between disagreeing and being disagreeable. He has been a credit to the Senate, to Florida, to the nation, and to his family. I wish him well as he returns to his beloved state and embarks on a new chapter in his life—one that I hope will be filled with happiness and good health for him and his wife, Priscilla. He will be missed by all those fortunate enough to have worked with him.

CONSIDERATION OF IMMIGRATION MATTERS

Mr. LEAHY. I would like to commend Senator REED for allowing us to proceed on several important immigration matters even though the Republican majority has refused to act on his compelling legislation to do justice for Liberians. Senator REED has been a persistent advocate for the Liberian nationals who have fled the strife in their nation for the United States. He has recognized that the U.S. has a special relationship with Liberia's citizens and has sought to respect and enhance that relationship. But his efforts have been resisted by the majority, which has consistently denied his requests to take up his bipartisan bill, which